

REMARKS

I. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1 and 13 are amended herein. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 4-13 and 16-20 are rejected.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 4-13 and 16-20 are currently pending in this application.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

In items 3-5 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the terms "sizeable" and "generally" in claims 1 and 13 render the claims indefinite. Therefore, the claims are amended herein to clarify these issues.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY ENDO ET AL. (U.S. PATENT 5,801,713)

Claim 1 as amended specifically recites how a "plurality of **automatic paging display modes** includes at least the following two display modes: **a cursory reading display mode** in which **title and emphasized parts**, of the document contents in each page, **are extracted to display** so that the outline of the contents of each page is viewable to the user; and an **outline view display mode** in which **only document structure is displayed as a layout** so that the whole of each page is viewable to the user". Endo et al. (hereinafter: Endo) fails to disclose, teach or suggest such features of the present invention as specifically recited in, for example, claim 1.

Instead, Endo is directed to contents that include moving picture images. When coordination between the **speed of display of the moving picture image** and the **speed of paging** can not be obtained, multiple paging speed modes are prepared in Endo to facilitate coordination between the speed of display of the moving picture image, and the speed of paging. That is, in Endo, a reader selects a desirable paging speed mode wherein the speed of paging is arbitrarily set by the reader (human beings), and is not set according to human visual perception characteristics. The modes are also set according to the tracking speed ability of the system. More specifically, lopping off moving picture images or halting the display of moving

picture images is performed according to the mode. That is, Endo fails to include any factors resulting from human visual perception characteristics.

In contrast, the present application clearly shows a user in a relationship between the contents-reading characteristics and the constituents of the contents to be displayed wherein the reading characteristics are utilized for setting a paging mode, without the depending on the user's intentions. Thus, the elements of the page contents, which then can be read in the thus set mode are selected and displayed. More specifically, Applicant recites how a "plurality of **automatic paging display modes** includes at least the following two display modes: a **cursor reading display mode** in which **title and emphasized parts**, of the document contents in each page, **are extracted to display** so that the outline of the contents of each page is viewable to the user; and an **outline view display mode** in which **only document structure is displayed** as a layout so that the whole of each page is viewable to the user" in, for example, claim 1.

It is noteworthy that in contrast to Endo, Applicant's claimed invention as specifically recited in, for example, claim 1, does **not** specify the paging speed. Instead, Applicant's invention in claim 1, for example, recites how the modes corresponding to the reading characteristics include, for example, "an **outline view display mode** in which **only document structure is displayed as a layout** so that the whole of each page is viewable to the user", "an automatic paging display mode corresponding to the user's desired **reading mode**", and "a **cursor reading display mode** in which **title and emphasized parts**, of the document contents in each page, **are extracted to display**". That is, in Applicant's claimed invention, only the information corresponding to a mode selected depending on the reading characteristics is extracted from the contents, and is then displayed.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's claimed invention as specifically recited in, for example, claim 1, differs from Endo in that Applicant's invention is not directed to changing of the paging speed. Further, Applicant utilizes the following three display modes corresponding to the reading characteristics: a **layout view display mode** in which only the layout (document structure) is shown; a **cursor reading display mode** in which only title parts and emphasized parts are shown; and a **reading display mode** in which all the contents are displayed. The user selects one of the above display modes. Further, Applicant's claimed invention as specifically recited in, for example, claim 1, recites how only "title parts and emphasized parts ... are extracted" under a cursor reading display mode, and that only "document structure is displayed as a layout" in the outline view display mode. As a result, the information amount of the contents to be displayed is significantly reduced so that the processing speed is increased.

It is respectfully submitted that Endo fails to disclose, teach or suggest the above-described features of Applicant's claimed invention as specifically recited in, for example, claim 1.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences in the various other claims over the cited references.

IV. THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 4-12 AND 16-20 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER ENDO ET AL. (U.S. PATENT 5,801,713) IN VIEW OF PALMER ET AL. (U.S. PATENT 6,002,798)

The above comments for distinguishing over Endo also apply here, where appropriate.

It is respectfully submitted that nothing was cited or has been found in Palmer suggesting modification of Endo to overcome the deficiencies discussed above.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

V. CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 21, 2006

By: 

Uchendu O. Anyaso
Registration No. 51,411

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501